

SECRET

23 July 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Staff Meeting Minutes of 23 July 1980

25X1

Mr. Carlucci chaired the meeting.

25X1

McMahon reported briefly on the following:

--The Shah continues to survive and that his will to live is strong; McMahon noted the Shah's doctor is preparing to go on vacation for about a month.

: Cable report that Iranian diplomats have access to U.S. post exchanges.

25X1

25X1

--Liberia: Report that the Soviet Ambassador, following a brief visit to Moscow, has offered to provide Liberia with helicopters and gunboats.

25X1

SECRET

Fitzwater commented briefly on success of the new personnel processing system and noted that 27 percent of recent hires are female. He announced that the manager for the new Family Liaison Service will be aboard next week. Lastly, Fitzwater reported that OPM Director Campbell has disseminated a notice to agencies re SES (SIS) bonus payments: guidelines are that payments to 20 percent of those eligible should be the norm with 25 percent set as a ceiling. Mr. Carlucci described briefly how some agencies have already exceeded OPM guidelines, for example, by counting the number of eligibles against vacant positions as well thus raising the percentage. [ ]

25X1

Lipton reported briefly on the HPSCI hearing yesterday re a reprogramming request and Reserve releases which resulted in committee approval. Hitz added that the session went well. Lipton reported also that we are in a difficult situation re year-end financing. He noted, for example, that an increase in the number of [ ] plus higher overseas costs have resulted in a [ ] funding increase. He said he may have to postpone the Comptroller's meeting with DD's scheduled for this week in order to reassess prospects for year-end financing. [ ]

25X1

25X1

25X1

Hetu said Joe Holsinger, former aid to the late Representative Ryan, will make a television appearance on "News Probe" (Channel 20, Sunday, 27 July) re CIA involvement in Guyana. Relatedly, Hitz said Congressional investigations have not uncovered any involvement by this agency. [ ]

25X1

Hetu reported today's Christian Science Monitor includes an article on alleged CIA broadcasts to Iran (attached) by an anonymous writer who claims to be a retired CIA officer. [ ]

25X1

Hetu said the Washington Star is requesting a background briefing on Liberia. This prompted Mr. Carlucci to recount comments by SSCI members at yesterday's hearing on the Jamaica incident--comments berating the Administration for leaks. He said Senator Bayh queried him specifically about yesterday's Washington Post article by David Leigh on Saudi Arabia in reference to CIA background briefings to the media. Mr. Carlucci said he explained that information on a related NIE had leaked well before the background briefing. Mr. Carlucci noted he found himself in an awkward situation responding to committee charges re leaks in the Executive Branch. He stressed that we are now in an entirely new atmosphere with Oversight Committees in this regard and that he questions the advisability of continuing our background briefings to the media; he added the Hill views such briefings as leaks or potential leaks to the press. A brief discussion followed on the pros and cons of continuing background briefings; Mr. Carlucci said he would reflect on these. [ ]

25X1

In response to a query from Hitz, Mr. Carlucci said we are not the source of press-reported intelligence information re Billy Carter's relationships with the Government of Libya. [ ]

25X1

SECRET

SECRET

In response to a query from Fitzwater, Mr. Carlucci said he felt yesterday's SSCI session went well. He noted Senator Bayh is now seized with the problem of gaining Identities Legislation this year, a change from the Senator's previous view toward gaining this legislation next year. Mr. Carlucci said also it became clear to him at this session that cover is improperly understood by some committee members, i.e., they feel, for example, that good cover would obviate the need for Identities Legislation. He said they do not understand the trade-off between cover and operational flexibility and that he has promised them a report accordingly. Mr. Carlucci asked that McMahon and [ ] develop the report in a way that will ensure a clear understanding. [ ] (Action: DDO and C/CCS/DDO)

25X1

25X1

Hetu said media queries continue about Agency requirements for pre-reviews of former DCI Bush's campaign speeches relating to intelligence; he noted he has also received a call from Bob Gambino who is sympathetic to our situation. A brief discussion followed on ways to handle this: Mr. Carlucci asked Hetu and Hitz to give serious thought to any offer by Bush to submit such speeches for pre-review and said, if advisable, he will be glad to call Bush or his advisor, Jim Baker, accordingly; he noted Baker's legal background. [ ]

25X1

Hitz said re oversight language that next Monday appears to be the only "window" for final action on the Authorization bill before committee members leave town; he noted Representatives Burlison and Robinson (HPSCI) are moving to match Senate action. Hitz noted also re Appropriations bill mark-up, we are on the bottom of the list for House actions, i.e., Defense items will be dealt with first affording us some flexibility. He said he has no current information on which items the HAC will bear down on. [ ] opined that unlike Snodgrass, Murphy might be prevailed upon to let us see the spreadsheets. Lastly, Hitz reminded Mr. Carlucci of the Senate Appropriations Committee hearing scheduled for this Friday. [ ]

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

[ ] said GAO interests in MODE are focusing initially on nonintelligence aspects, but noted implications for intelligence. [ ]

Attachment

SECRET

DISTRIBUTION II From the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, 23 July 1980, page 22

# OPINION AND COMMENTARY

## An ex-spy defends those CIA broadcasts to Iran

By Anonymous

The recent acknowledgment by unidentified Washington "officials" that a clandestine radio station ("Free Voice of Iran") was being backed by the CIA has again put the agency in the stocks. The broadcasts allegedly used terms like "fascist" and "racist" for Ayatollah Khomeini, supported exiled leader Shahpur Bakhtiar, called for the "liberation" of Iran, and appealed to Iranians to prepare for armed action.

Before examining these points, there is a fundamental one which bears periodic repetition because it is so consistently ignored: The CIA does not conduct such operations without approval (if not instigation) from the highest levels of the executive branch, and without careful review by various legislative committees.

No less fundamental is our need to face up to the world as it really is, as opposed to the world as we would like it to be. As Americans, our problem is that we try to impose our domestic rules and values internationally. This is fair enough when it comes to controlling activities by foreigners here, like South Korea's rent-a-congressman operation, but does not always make sense when dealing with other cultures on their grounds. When it comes to promoting long-term US interests overseas, our rules (violence aside) should be at least as flexible as those of the local environment.

Well, who needs clandestine propaganda? What is the rationale for unattributed outlets? There are several reasons:

- In countries where the United States stands branded as an enemy, resistance to any message from an official American station is very strong — when indeed its very call sign does not impose a grave risk on the listener. To reach these audiences an unofficial medium is necessary.

- There are some messages which the United States wishes to put across but which it cannot do openly for a variety of reasons: because they would offend friends, be perceived as transcending permissible levels of meddling, might imply deeper commitments than the US was willing to make.

- Finally, the restrictions that the very fact of official sponsorship puts on a medium can inhibit language and terminology to the point that it no longer has any impact. An au-

dience accustomed to heady levels of vituperation in its own media may yawn at more measured presentations.

None of the above justifies a massive resort to such means, nor does it absolve sponsors from responsibility for unexpected results of their efforts. Long ago Radio Free Europe, for example, was blamed for giving Hungarians the impression that the US would come to their aid if they rose up against the Soviet Union. That blame was not entirely unwarranted, but it must be recalled that the US had, after all, adopted a policy some years earlier of "rolling back communism" and had never explicitly rescinded it. The problem was that Radio Free Europe was so clearly under official US sponsorship that its "unofficial" status was no longer believable.

Clandestine radio broadcasting needs a base abroad, a pool of high-quality talent drawn from recent émigrés, and an ostensible sponsor (individual or group) which may or may not be aware of the true source of support. All of these factors make precise control extremely difficult, and as a result the broadcasting product does on occasion deviate from the ideal.

Let us now return to the "Free Voice of Iran" and the probable reasons why it came into existence.

First, we may accept the thesis that Iran today is being governed by individuals whose hostility toward the US has reached unusual extremes.

Second, it is probably not in the interests of the US that these individuals continue to run the affairs of Iran.

Third, the Iranians themselves (or the effects of internecine strife at the top levels) will probably dispose of the incumbent leaders before too much longer, and we will be confronted with new faces.

Fourth, it is palpably in the interests of the US that this new group of leaders (a) reflect Iranian not Soviet or other foreign interests, (b) reorient some of Iran's hate-America energies into more productive channels, and (c) establish a more stable, law-abiding society.

In order to accomplish these aims, it can be assumed that the US wanted to support those Iranians who opposed the current leadership; the problem was to do so without admitting it. Hence the unattributed radio.

Now as to those particular aspects which were so upsetting to some in the American press:

- The Ayatollah was termed a "fascist" and a "racist." His penchant for xenophobic

demagoguery, backed by officially encouraged mob action, does rather take one back to the brown shirts of the 1920s and the jackboots of the 1930s, but one is not supposed to say so in polite international society. True, but in terms of the broadcasts' ostensible sponsorship such terminology would be part of the normal give and take of Iranian politics; anything softer would have been suspect.

- The broadcasts supported the exiled Shahpur Bakhtiar. Is this bad from the standpoint of US interests? It becomes so only when official US sponsorship is revealed. (Needless to say, that is also bad for Shahpur Bakhtiar, whether or not he was previously aware of clandestine US support for the radio.) The point is, an ostensible sponsor or cause was needed, and Shahpur Bakhtiar seems to have been a logical choice.

- The broadcasts called for the "liberation" of Iran. Well, yes, that is the usual terminology used by "outs" when trying to unseat "ins" in parts of the world where exile is the price of political defeat.

- The broadcasts reportedly "even appealed to Iranians to prepare for armed action." If read swiftly, that might sound like a call to arms; another interpretation is that it was merely a warning to the citizenry to take prudent steps to avoid becoming noncombatant casualties.

Until leaked in Washington, and then publicized and virtuously decried in the American press, "Free Voice of Iran" appears to have been a needed counterbalance to what, even then, was a one-sided presentation. The station has now become, instead, a source of national embarrassment.

Who is most to blame for this? The CIA, for running the operation? The White House, for authorizing it? The Congress, for approving it? Or officials who no longer seem to have the right of silence on matters affecting national security, and a press that does not exercise restraint in the national interest?

*The author, requesting anonymity, describes himself as a retired CIA officer who was not involved with "Free Voice of Iran" but has observed similar activities where he served in the past.*